

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1, 7 and 9-23 have been amended herein. Claims 1-23 remain pending in the case. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

CLAIM REJECTIONS
35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 are rejected under U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 6, 198, 696 issued to Korpi et al. (hereafter referred to as Korpi). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 are not anticipated or suggested by Korpi.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to amended Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of management of time zone information in a calendar application, comprising:
 storing an event associated with a duration of time in which said event is to take place for a time zone;
 storing a time zone attribute associated with the time zone;
 establishing a display time zone based on a present location of a user of said calendar application;
 translating the duration of time associated with the event from the stored time zone attribute to the display time zone to produce a translated duration of time wherein said display time zone is independent of said event; and
 displaying the event as occurring at the translated duration of time.

Independent Claim 9 recites a similar limitation. Claims 3-8 that depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 10-16 that depend on independent Claim 9 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Korpi to teach a method for tracking time zone changes in communications devices. Korpi purports to teach that the reference time is based upon travel of the device (Column 5 lines 18-20). Furthermore, Korpi teaches the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip without updating the information in the itinerary of the memory (Column 5 lines 26-30).

Korpi associates the reference time with an anticipated trip event (Column 5 lines 38-39). However, the claimed embodiments of the present invention do not associate the reference time with an anticipated event. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 9 recite the limitation "wherein said display time zone is independent of said event." In fact, Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed limitations of the present invention because with Korpi, the dynamic adjustment of the time-of-day clock will lead to a display of inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip without updating the information in the itinerary of the memory. Korpi uses planned events to modify the reference time.

The claimed limitations of the present invention use a display time zone that is independent of the planned events. In fact, the claimed embodiments of the present invention uses a time zone attribute to translate the stored duration of time to produce a translated duration of time. Thus, the claimed embodiments of the present invention will not display inaccurate time information if a user postpones a trip because the display time is independent of anticipated events in the calendar.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does Korpi teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 9, and that these Claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Korpi does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-8, which depend from independent Claim 1, and Claims 10-16, which depend from independent Claim 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-16 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of Pub No US 2003/0009411 issued to Ram et al (hereafter referred to as Ram). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and

respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 2 and 10 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Korpi in view of Ram.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event. Ram does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. In fact, Ram teaches transforming NASDAQ Level II data for any selected security, at any instant in time, into a format suitable for display on the grid-based graphical display (paragraph 0269). Applicants understand “grid-based” to refer to a grid-based computing environment (Abstract) and not to a daily time grid, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Ram teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 2, or 10 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

Claims 17 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi in view of US Pat No 6, 631, 402 issued to Devine et al (hereafter referred to as Devine). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Korpi in view of Devine.

As stated above, Korpi and the claimed invention are very different. Korpi actually teaches away from the claimed invention by associating the reference time with an anticipated travel event. Devine does not remedy the deficiencies in Korpi. Devine may teach selection of a time zone by menu choice for establishing a report schedule (column 18 lines 21-25), but Devine fails to teach or suggest assigning a time zone attribute to an event, as claimed by the present invention. Furthermore, Devine fails to teach or suggest a display time zone that is independent of a planned event, as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Korpi and Devine teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 17 and 19-22 and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the amended Claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections and objections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-23 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 7/13, 2004



Anthony Murabito
Registration No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060